

## REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 8 and 12 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 1 and 12 have each been amended to correct a typographical error by inserting the article "a" before "line of sight".

Independent claim 1 has been further amended by changing "transmitter for producing" to "transmitter that produces".

Independent claim 12 has been further amended by changing "producing" to "using a multi-beam transmitter to produce" and by changing "receiving signals from at least one of said diffusing spots through a plurality of receiving elements" to "using a receiver that comprises a plurality of receiving elements to receive signals from at least one of said diffusing spots through said receiving elements".

Dependent claim 8 has been amended to correct a misspelling by changing "phtodetector" to "photodetector".

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 9, 10 and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,245,460 to Allen et al., hereafter Allen.

This rejection is traversed on the basis that Allen lacks one or more elements recited in the rejected claims.

Allen lacks a receiver that comprises a plurality of receiver elements wherein each receiver element has an independent field of view that is in a line of sight of at least one of said diffusing spots as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 12. Allen shows a plurality of receivers, but does not disclose or

teach that each receiver has a plurality of receiving elements. Therefore, Allen lacks a receiver that comprises a plurality of receiver elements wherein each receiver element has an independent field of view that is in a line of sight of at least one of said diffusing spots as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 12.

Allen also lacks an array of diffusing spots wherein the array is in the form of a regular grid as recited in dependent claims 3, 4, 14 and 15. Allen's line of illuminated portions in Fig. 2 is a single line and not a regular grid, i.e., a plurality of rows and columns of diffusing spots.

Allen also lacks the grid of diffusing spots being formed via the emission from the transmitter of a plurality of collimated beams of equal intensity as recited in dependent claims 4 and 15. Allen does not disclose or teach a transmitter that emits collimated beams of equal intensity.

Allen also lacks an array of diffusing spots that are approximately equidistantly positioned from one another as recited in dependent claims 5 and 16. Allen's illuminated portions in Fig. 2 are side by side with no spacing and, therefore, cannot be equidistantly positioned from one another.

Allen also lacks a receiver comprising a plurality of receiving elements that are each aimed in a different direction as recited in dependent claims 9 and 17. As noted above, Allen does not disclose or teach a receiver having a plurality of receiving elements. Therefore, Allen cannot disclose or teach that each receiving element is aimed in a different direction.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 1-5, 9, 10 and 12-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Allen is obviated by the amendment and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Allen in view of U.S Patent No. 5,195,103 to Hinton et al., hereafter Hinton.

This rejection is traversed for the reason that Allen lacks a receiver that comprises a plurality of receiving elements as noted in the discussion of the rejection of independent claim 1, from which claims 6 and 7 depend. Hinton does not supply Allen's deficiency.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claims 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Allen in view of U.S Patent No. 5,995,235 to Sui et al., hereafter Sui.

This rejection is traversed for the reason that Allen lacks a receiver that comprises a plurality of receiving elements as noted in the discussion of the rejection of independent claim 1, from which claim 8 depends. Sui does not supply Allen's deficiency.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects claim 11 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as unpatentable over Allen in view of U.S Patent No. 5,293,272 to Jannson et al., hereafter Jannson.

This rejection is traversed for the reason that Allen lacks a receiver that comprises a plurality of receiving elements as noted in the discussion of the rejection of independent claim 1, from which claim 11 depends. Jannson does not supply Allen's deficiency.

For the reason set forth above, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is erroneous and should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth above that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn, that claims 1-17 be allowed and that this application be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 9/13/09



Paul D. Greeley  
Reg. No. 31,019  
Attorney for Applicants  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
(203) 327-4500